E.D.N.Y. – Bklyn 03-cv-5418 96-cr-339 Townes, J.

## United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE
SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 20<sup>th</sup> day of September, two thousand sixteen.

Present:		
Pierre N. Leval, Raymond J. Lohier, Jr.,		
·	Circuit Judges,	
Edward R. Korman,*  District Judge.		
Umeme Raysor,	Petitioner,	
v.	1 etitioner,	16-2939
United States of Am	erica,	
	Respondent.	

Petitioner moves for leave to file a successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the motion is GRANTED, because Petitioner has made a prima facie showing that he has satisfied the successive motion requirements with respect to his proposed claim based on *Miller v. Alabama*, 132 S. Ct. 2455 (2012). It is further ORDERED that the proceeding is TRANSFERRED to the district court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1631.

Since this Court has determined only that Petitioner has made a prima facie showing that he has satisfied the successive motion requirements, see 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(C), the district court is directed to address, as a preliminary inquiry under § 2244(b)(4), whether the Supreme Court's decision in *Miller* entitles Petitioner to relief. See Quezada

<sup>\*</sup> Judge Edward R. Korman, of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, sitting by designation.

## Case 16-2939, Document 18, 09/20/2016, 1866640, Page 2 of 2

v. Smith, 624 F.3d 514, 521-22 (2d Cir. 2010) (discussing prima facie standard); Bell v. United States, 296 F.3d 127, 128 (2d Cir. 2002) ("the prima facie standard [applies to] our consideration of successive habeas applications under § 2255 . . . .").

FOR THE COURT: Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk

Catherine SECOND & CARCHIT & CARCHIT